

READER'S DIGEST



ROVING EDITOR • Henry Hurt

September 10, 1982

Dear Harold,

Thank you for your letter. I appreciate it on several counts.

I greatly appreciate your candid comments about the Kurtz book. Frankly, I at first thought it appeared to have some merit, but then as I worked along on my own material I began to find his mistakes. Would you object to asking Jim to let me have a look at your annotated copy of the Kurtz book? One of the specific points I wanted to ask you about was your opinion of his assessment of the HSCA's analysis of the neutron activation tests. The results certainly looked screwy to me, and I have asked a researcher to try to round up some independent authorities who might say whether Guinn's and the HSCA's conclusions are warranted. Has anyone other than Kurtz published anything on those results? I would be grateful for any help you could give me on that.

I've now gotten familiar with your court case on the matter of the spectrographic testing results. What an incredible experience you have had! The arrogance of the courts and the government are virtually beyond comprehension. Nothing in the Shadrin effort has been so blatant. I have not, of course, read the raw material in your case, but Jim sent me the summary of the various stages as the case has developed. I am using parts of that--including the Kilty flip-flop--in what I'm doing. I will show it to you for your opinion and for accuracy when I have that section finished.

One question that may seem very stupid--and, if so, forgive me. I remain unclear from reading the summary whether you ever actually got any of the original spectrographic test results from 1964. I understand that you continue to fight for those that would bear on the curb shot (Tague, etc.). As I write this section, I need to know whether the government continues, to this day, to refuse access to any of the raw test data. ~~This would be the case with the HSCA's review of the Warren Commission's test results done by the FBI for the Warren Commission in 1964 and said that by using his modern techniques, he was able to determine that those tests agreed with his own data especially for HSCA.~~

Any guidance you can give me on this angle will be tremendously appreciated. It seems to me, simply (and perhaps igno-

CHATHAM, VIRGINIA 24531
Telephone: 804 432-1400

September 10, 1982

rantly) that if Guinn's tests are credible and conclusive, then we have moved a long way toward having to agree that CE 399 left fragments in Connally's wrist. I have drawn no conclusions, of course, and look forward to what you might have to say on that point.

About the green herons: I would have guessed that the pair favoring me were little blue herons until I actually took a bird book to the pond. Even though the pair at my pond are blue, the several bird books I consult indicate that they are little green herons. In this Kennedy case, I keep learning that white is black and black is white. In herons, green seems to be blue and perhaps blue is green? Wow!

Here's another angle I need your help on: I am trying to figure out the most illustrative way in which to show just how much material relating to the Kennedy case continues to be withheld from the public. I needn't tell you how confusing it is when you begin to consider the cubic feet of the National Archives and the documents with varying number of pages at other agencies. I would be interested in what you might suggest as the most meaningful way to get a handle on this. Simply, I would like to be able to show the general public the volume of material being withheld and roughly by whom.

More specifically, I would like to know what you think are the most significant batches of material that continue to be withheld. I included Oswald's 1962 tax return in my first draft of my introduction, but I suppose I need to revise that now that it has been turned over to Marina. (Have you seen the return yet? Do you know if I can get a copy from anyone but her? She has a habit of requiring large sums of money for cooperation, and I'm not interested in that.) But what do you think are the documents still withheld that contribute the most to the public's distrust of the government on the whole matter of the Kennedy case?

By the way, you will get no argument from me about Nosenko. Even if my Fedora piece in RD, I did not claim to understand what's going on about Nosenko. The biggest point about Nosenko is that if the CIA cares about having him be credible (and goodness' knows, there is no reason to think CIA cares!), then some explanation has to be made for the questions I raised in my article--and the questions raised by so many others. Indeed, I would like to see anything you have or are getting on Nosenko, and I would value hearing what you think about him.

I appreciate your comments several letters back about Hosty. I've seen him a couple of times and do not find him a very credible person. And, of course, there are the reasons you point out that weigh against his credibility. I did not mean to sound presumptuous in saying that I hoped to "set straight" the Hosty question. I do not intend to spend much time on it at all, beyond relating the account of the destruction of the note and trying to show accurately where the orders might have come from.

September 10, 1982

(I understand Shanklin is near death from cancer, by the way.) The biggest point Hosty makes to me is his claim that he did not know who Kostikov was. I have no trouble stating that today Hosty claims he had no idea who Kostikov was, but that does not bear in any large sense on the event beyond simply including Hosty's disclaimer on that point. (Originally, Hosty got in touch with me purely about that point, and his concerns have expanded since then.) In any event, I will value what you have to say on that point. We can discuss it when we finally get together, which I hope will not be too long from now. (I've quit making myself look foolish by being specific on that matter!)

(1978)

Can you tell me if Ruby and Shaw were ever positively linked? And what was the final best thinking on whether Ruby was a homosexual?

I was most interested in your letter of 4/16 and the references to the handling of Kennedy's body after the shooting. What is the citation for your comment that "the shot in the neck was above his collar." I have not run into that and would appreciate knowing the citation.

What is your opinion of the so-called Torbett records? Can you tell me something briefly about that?

the Another angle I picked up in your latest brief that was new to me concerns the assertion on Page 5 that the FBI and SS felt that ~~a~~ second bullet hit Connally and that the WC disagreed. Can you give me a citation for that? I cannot readily find it.

(The FBI & SS believing there was a second shot.)

What is your opinion of the whole matter raised by Penn Jones of an extraordinary number of deaths among Kennedy assassination witnesses, etc. Your opinion would be valuable to me in deciding whether to get into that.

I know a letter such as this must be worrisome to you, and I apologize. Please keep in mind the very good advice Bud gave me when I told him last fall that we were going to do a review of the whole subject. Bud said he thought it could be done in a reasonable amount of time "as long as you don't try to reinvent the wheel." I have thought of that many times as I've gone about this, knowing that there is no way on earth I can become an expert. I will never even make that pretense. My aim is to work with those who are experts and who are kind enough to be willing to help. The book itself, in these areas, will make no pretenses of digging new ground. I simply hope that a broad general review--one that, regrettably, must avoid becoming embroiled in tedious details that in the end remain hopelessly fuzzy--will be a vehicle upon which the most important informa-

Hurt to Weisberg

-4-

September 10, 1982

tion can be broadcast to a wide audience. Between us, something like Legend spent far too much time on the Nosenko question--which in the end just didn't make much sense to any general reader. I believe, though, that people would find fascinating so much material that I have picked up from careful, intelligent critics such as you and others. Above all, I thank you for your patience with what must seem like awfully stupid questions. Take hope, though, in knowing that I'm not sensitive about being told a question is stupid. I am just very grateful for your willingness to help.

I am certainly not ignoring your kind questions about your suit and the pictures. I am going to look at that more carefully. I wanted, though, to get off these other questions to you.

With every good wish, I remain,

Cordially yours,

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland

21701